

Date

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. 		2/24
2. C/PPG		
3.		
4.		
5.		

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

I agree fully with your observations and conclusions. Can we actually implement the establishment of RESTRICTED by DoD with a reqmt. that such material will be handled by CIA in the same manner as CONFIDENTIAL, but CIA will not generate any RESTRICTED material? Would it be necessary to allow CIA to place RESTRICTED on material we generate in a response to DoD-originated stuff? It would be nice if we could contain the spread of this abomination, but it promises to be very difficult. 'Twould be better had it been strangled in the crib.

Only if the response does not involve CIA input that may be classified under our standards.

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
	Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

STAT

STAT

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Revision of E.O. 12065

FROM:

C/PPG

4-E-70 Hqs.

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

24 February 1982

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

DD/P&M

24 FEB 1982

2/26

2.

C/PPG

26 FEB 1982

3.

C/Policy

26 FEB 1982

Hrb

4.

5.

Record

6.

Registry

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Attached is FYI. It appears the DCI is supporting, to some extent, DoD's pitch for a "RESTRICTED" classification. I have heard rumors that it may well be incorporated into the replacement for EO 12065. We should try to ensure that it is clearly understood to be a DoD category and that we don't have to use it.

Agree

5. It is the understanding of the Chairman, SECDEF, that DoD has dropped the issue of a "Restricted" category. Regardless, the restriction is under White House scrutiny and Agency input is no longer a factor in the new Executive order. Closed for the time being as Registry is in the absence of pending action on our part.

3/24/82

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

24 FEB 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Policy and Plans Group

FROM:

Policy and Plans Group

STAT

SUBJECT: Revision of E.O. 12065

1. Per your request, the DCI's letter of 19 February 1982 to the Director, OMB, has been reviewed in comparison with my memorandum of 23 February, as the latter addresses the DoD position on addition of a Restricted category.

2. The DCI letter is interesting in that it does indeed address and support the DoD position as an issue not covered in the Agency response prepared by the Office of Information Services (OIS). Mr. Casey supports the DoD position principle in very positive terms, albeit in a presentation of options rather than endorsement of the original DoD proposal and rationale. There is no documentation of developments that led to general acceptance of the DoD initiative, except a statement that the matter had been discussed with the Secretary of Defense. Neither is there any language to establish that CIA will use (or be authorized to use) the Restricted category to protect intelligence information; the letter refers to DoD and "its needs."

3. The bad news, from a strict security standpoint, is that waiving security and safeguarding requirements is one of the options under consideration. The good news is that we can set up our own standards for safeguarding the new category of "classified" information with little trouble and, hopefully, will not have to deal with Restricted information generated internally.

4. The DCI letter confirms my understanding that the DoD proposal is not dead; with the endorsement of two Cabinet officers it is very much alive. It also supports the opinion that we should not oppose use of the new category within DoD, this despite the fact it is unlikely DoD would suffer imposition of meaningful access control or effective safeguards.

5. The DCI support of DoD super~~se~~^sdes the Agency position previously expressed by OIS with which we were in agreement. It remains to monitor any future versions of a new Executive Order

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

and implement the replacement for E.O. 12065. Any comments regarding the Restricted category must be limited to application within the Agency.



STAT

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY